

Appl. No.: 10/692,572
Attorney Docket No.: 10541-1894
Amendment in reply to Office Action of April 11, 2006

III. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Reply, claims 1, 3-5, 8-16 and 21 remain pending in the application.

Objections to the Drawings

The examiner objected to the drawings in that they failed to show a portion of the chute positioned "against" the front side of the substrate. This language has been deleted from the claims and, therefore, the objection to the drawings is believed to now be moot.

In view of the above amendment, it is submitted that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to because of the inserted language "and is welded to". Applicants have amended paragraphs [0018] and [0019] to delete reference to "and is welded to". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw these objections to the specification.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 were objected to by the examiner for informalities related to the use of the term "weld stud". These claims have been amended to specifically delete

Appl. No.: 10/692,572
Attorney Docket No.: 10541-1894
Amendment in reply to Office Action of April 11, 2006

the word "weld" as suggested by the examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw these objections to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,778,085 issued to Lipkin ("Lipkin"). Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9 and 13 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,527,063 issued to Garner et al. ("Garner"). Additionally, Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,739 issued to Dailey et al. (Dailey). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With reference to Claim 1, the claim has been amended to recite subject matter is generally analogous to that previously recited in claim 2. Claim 1 now recites that the seal extends over the ends of both the outer periphery of the airbag chute and the outer periphery of the door panel so as to seal these two elements.

Claim 2 was previously rejected as being anticipated by Garner. In particular, the examiner pointed to element 80a as being a seal extending around the periphery of Garner. However, upon detailed review of Garner, it is seen that 80a is the edge of the door panel and, in particular, an inturned flanged edge of the door panel, not a seal over the edge of the door. Accordingly, Garner fails to disclose a seal as claimed.

Claim 2 was also rejected as being obvious under § 103 based upon Lipkin in view of Dailey. In this regard, Dailey was recited as teaching a seal 40 extending around an outer periphery of a door panel. While the seal 40 of Dailey is disclosed as extending beyond the end of the door panel 24 and onto the substrate 20, as seen in

Appl. No.: 10/692,572
Attorney Docket No.: 10541-1894
Amendment in reply to Office Action of April 11, 2006

Figure 5 thereof, if Dailey were to be combined with Lipkin, there is no suggestion between the two references to form the seal such that the seal extends over the ends of both the outer periphery of the airbag chute and the outer periphery of the door panel. Such a seal in the combined teachings would at best extend only onto an outer surface of the airbag chute, not about the end of the chute so as to seal the assembly as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

The arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are equally applicable to independent claim 5. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 5 is likewise allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 3, 4 and 8-16 are all dependent claims from either claim 1 or claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable, at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 5.

New independent claim 21 recites that a seal is located between the outer surface of the substrate and the rear side of the chute, similar to prior dependent claim 8. In that Daily and Lipkin both fail to disclose a seal in the claimed location, it is submitted that the present claim is allowable over this combination of references.


Appl. No.: 10/692,572
Attorney Docket No.: 10541-1894
Amendment in reply to Office Action of April 11, 2006

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Applicants authorizes charging of any fee deficiency to the deposit account of Applicants' assignee, Visteon Global Technologies, Inc., as indicated in the Transmittal accompanying this Statement.

Respectfully submitted by,



Eric J. Sosenko
Reg. No. 34,440
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: 7-11-06

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000